

Wed, May 30, 12

What if: Archie's Red Line (used as) determine

(P.g. to S.B.

or blockade

or invasion

deal? — or S.B. Red Line?

e.g. to Nakamura

to invasion of ...

(What left, g "4"?)

to war on US?

to V-1, V-2; continued

Big?

How would, then, either of these  
differ from war determined: either I, or II?

Hyp: Lower of these put into a rule of law  
or, into "spirit of int. law"

as of 1939

(see Hoon on blockade & SB

POR; (Nether) ...

- Only one considered at Nuremberg (not really  
enforced, later)  
along with "aggression" (good - but not  
followed).

Time

Aug 17 (18th) 1 yr. anniversary of Wall  
anniversary of peace treaty

Aug 31 Peter Sleeter 4 days misty Am go home



Roback:

Is hemispheric or White - North Hem -  
possible?

(A threat to food in Santa?')

to Helman:

~~There~~ was our last 67 years was  
not just "possible" (say, by accident, about  
the same (small) level of prob. every year;  
it was much worse than that (which  
was also true):

it was monumentally high (even if  $< .5$ )

$$.16 \times .4 \times .4 \times .4$$

$$\begin{array}{r} .16 \\ .4 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

$$1 - .64 = .36 \text{ chance of } \text{no} \text{ no} \text{ no}$$

in 3 crises



Center

MX  
N-land  
P-II  
CM

Kaso of Shad → Center/By being SU into Afghan  
→ reference for RDE and MX (and for a Burns journal  
vs. SU, but also counterweight for France)  
and internal long-term work (prior to Stt power)

Curiously the poor (other) values of  
guilt over irregularity, being worse than poor

Center Da

Strategies &  
Force Planning:  
the case of the  
Persian Gulf  
late '80's

Epstein  
for the Holdings on Da

Reviewing hist. (Wolfe 78-79 - nice  
Planning for new us. from Rev.  
SU in Persian Gulf - 1940's,  
along with NATO

(Nitz)

see UK worries about Russian taking over India  
The Hunt Canyon

(Center Doctrine shifts to threat from external  
to internal regional threat: Iran, Iraq

Center's 200 Workshops

Center: In case SU responds to US. EU in PG by  
pressing in Europe (or possibly bombing)  
These threats get us new leadership - Center to Reagan  
(and from R to Bush. Clinton to Bush...)



Having an enemy is crucial to the development  
of the herd, strong leaders  
(Chick - Hawk...)

Leadership is a limited resource because  
after while, leaders for aggression -

If you're weak, lose credibility

not only will your group/position lose authority  
cred.  
influence

but the leader will lose standing

I/we must maintain credibility

That is a cheap measure, of influence;  
but at risk of big cost, losing 1) authority  
2) one's leadership  
role

---

(Douglas Houston Australian UK Prodigy  
of WWI)  
Kendall Wilson

Proving concern of UK attitude to  
Entente — if they didn't help Russia (+ France)  
Russia would turn to going into France  
(since was not the Continent, for UK).

In Britain's, Germany is unwanted as threat to UK  
not France — real concern (not Europe)

Keep Russia occupied in Europe.

---

TR



TR:

4-28-12

The moral origins & consequences of our  
new war plans (+ practices)

Barons (goals, treatments) & risks of  
it.

(+ it's the same now: in US  
and in Pak/Arabian)

My ~~added~~ interest in: threats  
risks (eventually)

X

Why so war?

me: Direct

(Halloran)

us. Wally & Pepperman

My answer: we were close —  
prob. at various <sup>crises</sup> points was high:

>.2, ~.5 whether higher than  
.5 or not, or somewhat less

Several times —

It was probably the worst all time.

Will there prob. be another



TR-

4-28-12

How many Americans are aware that  
on Aug. 8 SU entered Manchuria?

(to the surprise + chagrin of Japanese

i.e. that is worth explanation for ending  
the war -

|| McG B tracks would lead that you  
win a war by launching + threatening war!

Hurling

Covert was co-chairman of CPO

(member of Round-Table from '30's

McClay, He, Allen Dulles, <sup>?</sup>Baker,  
David Bruce.

Baker (for me, McG) to have sent another  
100K <sup>to lose after being</sup>

He didn't want to be accused of being  
VN the way his mentor DeLoach (his  
brother's father-in-law had lost China <sup>not being done  
anyway/anything</sup>

"The Estate"

Baker + DeLoach  
you

Liberal Republicans: Stimson { Bundy (father)  
McG son (warrior)  
Kearney  
McClay  
Allen Dulles  
McNamara (noted for? 1960)  
JFK's Nat. Sec.

FOR + JFK invited Republicans into Admin  
DeLoach? (Rph?)



In 64-65 DeLoach & McCloy are saying to  
McGB - you've got to go in.

Wittgenstein

Saying with a mountain

1  
D.M.

manuscript/DeLoach

TR: the mountain has been constructed  
and we stay with it.

DB

If are used - because they believe  
they are useful

(and that to lose - by failing to  
use them - would mean

- to be pushed out of ME  
(or Iran)

- to lose office

- "to lose NATO"

Defending Berlin gives us an excuse to  
build up SAC - to defend ME

We can't be perceived as bluffing

it will invite retaliation → regional  
integration that does not give US a privileged role -

Threat  $\rightarrow$  hold an alliance

To prevent East-West trade in Europe  
& Asia

that would limit US influence —

which brought us: more trade & investment  
on an even basis.

to keep Japan from trade

---

Korea's willingness to risk global TN War  
to ... make threats credible — to maintain  
alliances around the world

Rest of war

despite that it was considered  
+ threatened & proposed

and believed that it was very important  
not to be forced bluffing —  
and believed that it is

— other side worked during

they believed that threats had worked —  
confirming it

|| They have never been willing to give up FC  
threats (or etc.)



How did I come to see  
the world rich

(1981 - my study of the world!)

Challenger explosion

K/T Rpt:

K/T finding

"Convention of hostility"  
(under, Arrow?)

I see never coming in VN

70's



This explains better the world than:

"We build weapons

One

SU missiles: "defensive" IRBMs - ES weapons  
again

budget NATO strat. to Chap. Cuba

Type I Det has not been an policy  
over last 67 years - the Type II.

<sup>the</sup>  
Favors for protection (is there any difference  
between 2nd state D-L / protection / the ("protection")  
better = ) = )

To think

If South America were in NATO -  
the Russians wouldn't dare attack

If not? Well... (we'd blow up the world)

"If 'n (Ruhos) are willing to risk the world to win an election"

Sad in Dallas

Inability to know (anti-learning mechanism)

No "mistakes"

No more VNs?

No "concessions under threat"

MCGB to me on C-II and other crises

(PP - not dealless)

(IRBMs in Turkey;

WSEG "summit"

ABM in Europe

Northwood

Apology to Paks

for massive side

... Kunder can't change, admit error, after questions...

Subards don't want to ... give best news

C-II

on attitude  
Inability permitted to know or consider one (current, provocative) policies to which evening are responding or defending (or big surprises...)



Moral Universal of Leaders

For a leader to put his (her) status and jobs  
(and "credibility" — of his

and of US

"on the line" (to stake it, as in cards or  
roulette) ("on the table" — table stakes)

of a public declaration

is to make a strong commitment

to make it (appear, subjectively) "irreversible"  
to withdraw or concede or back down:

as if it were worse to go to worse,  
or to lose to global war

than to lose one's standing or jobs.

because to leaders, it is, or seems to be!

CBJ to Russell — "I'd be imprisoned —  
wouldn't I?"

Clarke — I would have been fired.

JFK to RFK — imprisoned

MCN to JFK on <sup>1000</sup>MM

McG B: "better to lose after with 100K

Dallas to LBJ: "When you look at alternatives  
to one war..." (in crisis:

JFK in C-119: Bitter y children he held...

Jobs at State

Exception to rule: as in VN, 61

C-I, VN-65

Having been imprisoned,  
threatened with amputation...

JFK  
McNair C-II:  
if he hadn't  
said that..."



Danger of threats —

- Executing threat is made feasible  
quickly + easily  
(in crisis)

JCS  
negotiation of  
options —  
for credibility

Alternatives have been deliberately made harder,  
slower, more costly (pivotal on, not prepared,  
blocked, not reversed —)

(Danger of Pres' reversals of Crisis execution

(Can't "reverse"

"Surrender"/conversion  
negot...)

Can't signal to JCS,

Push/Pull (so...)

= White Nights in Pentagon!

---

Ⓜ



Focus of VSCP —

Contingency: uprising in East Germany  
that splits ball in, against SU forces

— East German forces

— West German forces

(end of the land areas:  
to later Soviet forces!)

see K. Bros of (West) Germans

+ areas!

Yes, too — no

What if we put two areas in Berlin?

("in US control" !)

(McN considered it! — '62 — + 64, German  
Rück)

---

✓ wanted NFU in Europe (Nag, MHH, ANW,  
no. NATO  
no. HK)

Conventional build-up

My McN shared to NATO

(not others in an Berlin!

Helpful — but!

TR - Just

Dollars: in Qing

Nothing looks worth using unless until  
you come from to force with the  
consequences of not using them, and being  
forced to know how bluffing.

(Berlin, Gubert ...)

Baker

Douglas B. Smith: Dan Ostrom & the CW Wars

By the threat of Dollars & the to be  
unthinkable - but to be a bluff

so you must have conventional forces

"By doing exercises & training (for bluff) you  
are making it more likely that when  
certain circumstances, it will be carried  
out

(Center, SHO ... kg

unusual choice, in every, of plan or  
PREEMPT

(K being first - captured by B ("you'll  
never have

not a whole of proof - you'll know do  
this to us again."

quote

M



VFK on thinking;

3d Party

Emotive reasoning

skill  
Science

Douglas Murray review of 3 pp.

Robert Simpson, "Heart Advice  
Cites" (expert on VD's)

Human beings that is ~~class~~ categorised  
true - emotive - rather than Boolean  
true (B. statistics) -

[How explain

Simpson "Believing is Seeing" is a page in book

If  $\geq 25\%$  of neighbourhood are black,  
most groups are "black" disorder

the perceive

(blacks see it, latinos are more in red  
disorder)

(Hitler)

Narcissistic emotive reasoning: If group doesn't  
have me, they will be worse off, or be destroyed,

General for  
people who  
gain power

readers come to believe that  
2/ what they're doing

and (b) their big is power

is good for a group (not necessarily  
good for public as a whole — though  
they also come to think

"(Wob's (good for me is) good for USAF

and Wob's good for USAF is good for  
US & world

Easy to believe this — even when  
(to others) it's not good for  
(one's children, or USAF, or public...)

X New unhyphenated First Circle 2009

(Stalin's

"Stalin trusted nobody — except Hitler."



Chris from  
Protection from  
Chris Evans

Saint Stacey and  
Derek Keble  
Emily Dickinson

and the New World  
Thinking  
Cambridge Univ. Press

Clinton

Ostrander

1953 Berlin

Spring

William Borden

Pacific Alliance

(Int. Mil. Cooperation)

TR



6-25-12

are for threatening  
but operations

(when would we  
want to disarm SC)?

1) SC were what  
to attack us.

unless — WJ would they?  
China — being interested in?

2) False alarm —

or <sup>(b)</sup> crisis from (1983?)

we were about to war  
are about to disarm

the

only

2) SC challenged EU-ECU  
or threaten — war

after an FU on the  
ally

C China, NVN, NK,

( Iraq? Egypt (Israel)

Europe / Berlin